## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

CHESTER SHANE McVAY,	§	
Movant,	§ §	
v.	§ §	CASE NO. 3-07CV1101-M
HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES, INC.,	§ §	
Respondent.	§ §	

# MOVANT'S REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S OPPOSITION TO MCVAY'S MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE:

Chester Shane McVay ("McVay" or "Movant") files this Reply to Respondent's Opposition to McVay's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Brief in Support<sup>1</sup> and would show the Court the following:

#### BACKGROUND

- 1. Respondent sets forth purported facts in its Opposition's Background section. The following is provided to clarify and present the full picture of McVay's background, the underlying dispute, and the bases requiring vacatur of the Final Award.
- 2. McVay was employed at Respondent from January 15, 2001 to January 4, 2006. He held four positions, each a promotion from the former. McVay was awarded an MVP in December 2005 for some of his work and, in total, earned four MVPs in less than five years. He completed eleven design standards in 2005, six of those from approximately mid-November to the end of December. McVay has also been awarded two patents. *See* App. p. 50. When McVay resigned,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In accordance with Local Rule 7.1, McVay files this Reply within the fifteen days prescribed. McVay will file a separate Response, if any, to Respondent's Cross Motion to Confirm the Award within the twenty days prescribed.

he was working to complete three to four more design standards, one of which was a master software program for calculating performance envelopes, a derivative of a program he had prepared on his own. The Arbitrator failed to award him this program.

- 3. In 2002 McVay was calculating packer envelopes. Packer envelopes, basically, provide the performance limits for an oil well packer and such are then depicted on a graph for the customer. McVay suggested the entire calculation process might be automated. He was specifically, and consistently with each request, instructed not to work on this concept, refused training, and was not allowed time at work to prepare the software.
- 4. As a result, McVay taught himself code and developed the software on his own time, at his own expense, and using his own resources. None of this was done on Respondent's time, took away from McVay's work, or was part of an assignment from Respondent.
- 5. In October of 2003, McVay brought his software, at this point the first packer program, into Respondent's facilities. McVay kept the software password protected and the code locked with a digital signature. McVay's supervisor learned of the program through checking McVay's work as required by ISO 9001 standards.<sup>2</sup> McVay introduced the software to others at Respondent at his supervisor's request.
- 6. Respondent continually attempted to exert control over McVay's software, including forming a "team" to develop packer envelope standards in November 2004. At the initial meeting of this team, which included several levels of management, McVay made it very clear the software was his property. He explained in a closed-door meeting with supervisors after this initial meeting the software was his "intellectual property" and he had ownership rights to it.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Interestingly, McVay was not trained to write software. ISO 9001 requires training for all job functions evidencing writing software was not one of his job functions.

- 7. In March of 2005, McVay determined it was clearly time to leave Respondent. McVay began to explore opportunities and ultimately began interviewing with Caterpillar for a job in Illinois. He was hired to work in its transmission department.
- 8. McVay provided his resignation letter on January 3, 2006. He specifically stated he wanted the transition to be as smooth as possible. McVay sought to resign effective January 15. This was near a standard two week resignation and the five year anniversary of his hire date. He also had scheduled vacation during this time frame in order to participate in his uncle's wedding in Indiana.
- 9. McVay was requested to attend an exit interview on January 3. McVay was asked to sign, by Respondent's in-house counsel, two-page "acknowledgment" (containing substantively different terms that the original IPA), and was told other employees were being legally pursued for failing to sign the acknowledgment. At the exit interview, discussions were had regarding the master program, McVay's continuing claim of ownership in various programs, and completing the master program after he left. A discussion was also had regarding the return of items McVay may have in his possession, with no final determination being made.
- 10. McVay felt he was being strong armed and forced to make legal decisions without the advice of counsel at the exit interview. At the end of the exit interview, it was unclear to McVay what needed to be returned, whether McVay needed to sign the acknowledgment, and whether he was going to be allowed to complete his work on the master program. To sort through these issues, he began the process of locating a lawyer.
- 11. On January 4, 2006, McVay told Respondent's representatives he would abide by all agreements (which included the IPA) and would return any Respondent-related items his counsel advised him to return. Respondent's representatives were told McVay needed more time for

counsel to assist in determining his obligations. McVay also explained he would be unable to attend another meeting with Respondent's in-house counsel until his lawyer could be up to speed and present. McVay was quizzed by two levels of upper management regarding his hearing problems, whether Respondent had provided assistance with it (which it had not), and his father's work history before being told to leave the facility that afternoon.

- 12. On January 5, 2006, McVay was served with a lawsuit and Temporary Restraining Order. On the morning of January 10, 2006, boxes of documents/items and two computer CPUs were delivered to the undersigned's office to respond to the TRO. After substantial legal wrangling in the District Court in Dallas, Respondent initiated arbitration.
- 13. A number of events occurred during the arbitration clearly evidencing Respondent's campaign to damage McVay. Respondent sought, and the arbitrator allowed in large part, these activities. Respondent modified electronic file(s) on the Saturday evening, and approximately five hours, after the second and final session of his deposition. Respondent used McVay's unique ISO9001 identified and used the modified file(s) at the arbitration. It refused to produce documents timely (both through the lawsuit it brought and during the course of the arbitration). McVay was forced to file motions both in the court and in the arbitration seeking documents. Respondent's activities unnecessarily increased the expense and litigiousness of this matter. It took approximately nine months to receive responsive items.
- 14. Respondent even went so far as to seek, late, disgorgement of McVay's salary for the five years he worked at Respondent. Respondent invaded McVay's privacy, requested Caterpillar documents, and ultimately positioned itself to force McVay, in perpetuity, from any industry in which Respondent is involved or provides paper and electronic copies of documents and tangible things that concern its products or services. Respondent even subpoenaed McVay's father in

Oklahoma through the underlying lawsuit--the same suit it previously demanded be stayed

because of the arbitration.

MCVAY ENTITLED TO VACATUR OF FINAL AWARD

15. Respondent contends McVay must show "evident partiality" of the Arbitrator for vacatur.

This contention is inaccurate. Respondent dictated a different standard by incorporating the

AAA Employment Dispute Resolution Rules as part of the Halliburton Dispute Resolution

Rules.

16. At the outset it is notable McVay received his offer letter from Respondent in late

December 2000. He was asked to sign and return it. He left his home and employment in

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and moved to Dallas, Texas to work for Respondent. On January 15,

2001, on his first day of his employment, after resigning from his prior job and moving states, he

was forced into an arbitration agreement. It was, as most are, a take-it-or-be-unemployed

arbitration agreement offer.

17. As part of the Halliburton Dispute Resolution Rules, the AAA Employment Dispute

Resolution Rules apply. Appendix at p. 7, ¶ 2(A). As set forth in McVay's Motion, the

applicable rules require that the arbitrator shall have no relations that create "an appearance of

bias." AAA Employment Arbitration Rules, Rule 12(b) (ii). This Respondent-dictated standard

is not the "evident partiality" Respondent would like now to impose.

18. McVay has set forth in his initial Motion the facts establishing the appearance of bias, if

not evident partiality. At the very least, if a non-negotiable arbitration agreement is required of

an employee, the employer should, and must, adhere to the agreement's standards. Based on this

Respondent-dictated standard, it is clear the facts set forth establish the appearance of partiality

and, therefore, the entire Final Award should be vacated.

Movant's Reply to Respondent's Opposition to McVay's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award and Brief in Support R:\\\\1072\60673\SubPldgs\ReplyHESOpptoMotionVacateAward.doc

page 5

#### EXPERT FEES ARE EXPERT FEES

19. Respondent was awarded expert and consultant fees totaling \$44,991.42. Respondent acknowledges the Dispute Resolution Rules prohibit the award of expert and consultant fees. *See* Opposition at p. 8, ¶ 13. However, in an effort to continue its campaign against McVay, Respondent would have this court play name games. Respondent contends since the Arbitrator named the expert and consultant fees something different, such are no longer expert fees. Authors have long discounted this wordplay:

When I see a bird that walks like a duck and swims like a duck and quacks like a duck, I call that bird a duck.<sup>3</sup>

What's in a name? That which we call a rose By any other name would smell as sweet.<sup>4</sup>

Undisputedly, these are expert and consultant fees.

- 20. An argument that the fees should somehow be borne by McVay is buttressed by the clear language addressing other types of fees and expenses:
  - A. The expenses of witnesses shall be borne by the Party producing such witnesses, except as otherwise provided by law or in the award of the arbitrator.
  - B. All attorney's fees shall be borne by the Party incurring them except as otherwise provided by law, by the Plan, or in the award of the arbitrator.

\* \* \*

G. Except as otherwise provided by law or in the award of the arbitrator, all other expenses, fees and costs of proceedings under these Rules shall be borne equally by the Parties who are not Employees/Applicants.

Appendix at p. 11. The Rules contain specific provisions, *and exceptions*, that vary from witnesses, to attorneys fees, to a catch all for other expenses. However, no such exception exists

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Attributed to the Hoosier poet, James Whitcomb Riley, http://www.whatquote.com/quotes/James-Whitcomb-Riley/1718-When-I-see-a-bird-th.htm.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Romeo and Juliet (II, ii, 1-2).

for fees and expenses of experts and consultants.

21. The Arbitrator exceeded her authority in awarding expert and consultant fees, regardless

of the name chosen (whether it be bird, duck, rose . . . or damages). The Dispute Resolution

Rules specifically allocate to the party incurring such expenses the responsibility to bear same.

Id. Respondent must, at a minimum, be held to its own language in its non-negotiable

agreement.

# THE ARBITRATOR'S INJUNCTIVE RELIEF IS IN DISREGARD OF THE LAW

- 22. The Arbitrator awarded injunctive relief. The provision at issue is as follows:
  - 1) Injunctive Relief against McVay as follows:
    - a) McVay and those acting in concert with him are enjoined from utilizing in any fashion any paper and electronic copies of any documents and tangible things that concern Respondent products or services
- 23. Respondent contends the Arbitrator was entitled to award injunctive relief for purposes of protecting confidential information. Respondent's argument predominately hinges on protecting confidential information. McVay did not, and has not, argued regarding the authority of an arbitrator to award injunctive relief. Such may be warranted for protecting confidential information. However, this is not what the Arbitrator ordered in the Final Award.
- 24. Instead, the Arbitrator has set forth an injunction that is so vague, ambiguous and overreaching it is impossible not to violate its terms, and such must be vacated. The Arbitrator did not limit it to purportedly confidential information. It is conceivable calling a phone number on a Respondent advertisement for "widgets" would be utilizing a document that concerns Respondent products. And, this very violation of the injunction could occur decades from now as absolutely no time limitation is provided. It is abundantly clear this injunctive provision is

simply and completely in disregard of the requirement an injunction be definite, clear and precise, without requiring one to search for inferences or make conclusions about which individuals may differ. Therefore, the Final Award must be vacated as it is in clear disregard of the law.

#### CONCLUSION

THEREFORE, McVay requests that the Final Award be vacated as a result of arbitrator partiality. In the alternative, insofar as necessary, McVay requests the specific portions of the Final Award identified in his Motion and above be vacated as the Arbitrator exceeded her powers and the awards exhibit a manifest as regard of the law. McVay requests such other and further relief, at law or in equity, to which he may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregory M. Clift

**ROGGE DUNN** 

Texas State Bar No. 06249500

**GREGORY M. CLIFT** 

Texas State Bar No. 00795835

CLOUSE DUNN KHOSHBIN LLP

5200 Renaissance Tower

1201 Elm Street

Dallas, TX 75270-2142

Telephone:

(214) 220-3888

Facsimile:

(214) 220-3833

ATTORNEYS FOR MOVANT

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has been served upon all counsel of record in accordance with the Rule of Civil Procedure, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

John F. Booth Peter Schroeder Crutsinger & Booth LLC 1601 Elm Street, Suite 1950 Dallas, TX 75201

ĭ VIA ECF
□ VIA HAND DELIVERY
$\square$ VIA FAX (214) 220-0445
☐ VIA EMAIL: jbooth@ipoftexas.com
☐ VIA EMAIL: pschroeder@ipoftexas.com
□ VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL
☐ VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, RRR

/s/ Gregory M. Clift
GREGORY M. CLIFT

Date	Increase Percent	Bonus Percent	Current Monthly Salary	Increase per Month	Bonus Amount	New Monthly Salary	Job Title	Notes:
12/21/00		-					Associate Technical Prof.	Postmark on HES offer.
1/15/01	0.00%	0.00%	\$4,500.00		\$0.00		Associate Technical Prof.	Firet day at Halliburton
7/1/02	5.91%	0.00%	\$4,500.00	\$266.00	\$0.00	\$4,766.00	Associate Technical Prof.	2001 Review/Raise
8/1/02	9.00%	0.00%	\$4,766.00	\$429.00	\$0.00	\$5,195.00	Technical Prof.	Promotion
4/1/03	5.29%	0.00%	\$5,195.00	\$275.00	\$0.00	\$5,470.00	Technical Prof.	2002 Review/Raise
5/8/03	Hart's Engine each year.	eering Innova	ition Award ac	cepted at Offi	shore Techno	ology Confere	ence in Houston, Tx. One of	sixteen given worldwide
10/16/03	with it by bos	s (3 levels up	o) Austin Free	man in an info	ormal depart	ment meeting	d no idea award was coming in front of 50 of my peers. One ne normal amount) bonus.	
12/15/03							ldwide per year) instead of m pre-tax bonus.	nore valuable raise as
2/27/04	Application #	10789631 fil	led for patent	for Annular Pi	ressure Relie	of Collar tool t	hat I designed. Patent #7191	1813 issued 3/20/07.
4/1/04	4.24%	0.00%	\$5,470.00	\$232.00	\$0.00	\$5,702.00	Technical Prof.	2003 Review/Raise
	M/4D 443 Aug	adod (by over	orina) for State	il naakon Ea	at track proje	not use siven	14 wooks for completion 3 s	completed preject is 7
7/20/04	weeks, \$50,0 went on State	000 under bud oil employees	dget, and pass s computers w	sed testing on orldwide. Sta	first try; Con atoil bought 3	npetitor Baker packers at \$	14 weeks for completion. I o tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came w	1. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.
7/20/04 8/1/04 1/19/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application #	000 under bud oil employees 0.00%	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for	sed testing on voridwide. Sta \$285.10 Fiber Optic D	first try; Con atoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery Syst	npetitor Baker packers at \$ \$5,987.10 em and Side	tried 6x in 2 years and failed 80,000 each. Award came w	d. Big win for HES - news lith \$1000 pre-tax bonus. Promotion
8/1/04	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pac completed \$6	000 under but oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 iss ker that I des 60,000 under	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for ued 7/20/06. igned is qualif	sed testing on vorldwide. Sta \$285.10   Fiber Optic E Others names fied for 20,000 assed testing	first try; Con atoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery Syst who did not 0 psi pressure	npetitor Bakers packers at \$ \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute an	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came w Senior Technical Prof.   Pocket Mandrel Removal Sys	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is
8/1/04 1/19/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pac completed \$6	000 under but oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 iss ker that I des 60,000 under	dget, and passes computers was \$5,702.00 If for patent for ued 7/20/06. Gigned is qualify budget and p	sed testing on vorldwide. Sta \$285.10   Fiber Optic E Others names fied for 20,000 assed testing	first try; Con atoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery Syst who did not 0 psi pressure	npetitor Bakers packers at \$ \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute an	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 80,000 each. Award came w Senior Technical Prof.   Pocket Mandrel Removal System is the control of the cont	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05 5/17/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT paci completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03% Stock Option	000 under but oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 30159400 iss ker that I des 50,000 under ated among to 0.00%	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for ued 7/20/06. igned is qualif budget and p op manageme \$5,987.10	sed testing on vorldwide. Sta \$285.10   Fiber Optic E Others names fied for 20,000 assed testing ent. \$241.23	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery System who did not on first try. \$0.00	npetitor Bakers at \$ packers at \$ \$ \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute and, which is the Two packers at \$6,228.33	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came we senior Technical Prof. Pocket Mandrel Removal Syre listed first on patent. In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 senior Technical Prof.	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pace completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03% Stock Option 5.00%	000 under bud oil employees 0.00% 0.38369 filed 30159400 issi ker that I des 50,000 under ated among to 0.00%	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for ued 7/20/06. igned is qualif budget and p op manageme \$5,987.10  0%/year matu \$6,228.33	sed testing on vorldwide. Stall \$285.10 Stall \$285.10 Stall \$285.10 Stall \$285.10 Stall \$285.10 Stall \$285.10 Stall \$241.23 Stall \$241.23 Stall \$311.42	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery Systs who did not 0 psi pressure on first try. \$0.00	patitor Bakers at \$   \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute and which is the Two packers state   \$6,228.33 will come with   \$6,539.75	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came we senior Technical Prof. Pocket Mandrel Removal System is tended first on patent. In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 perior Technical Prof. Ithms. No benefit ever gained Principal Technical Prof.	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise d from these stock options.  Promotion
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05 5/17/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pac completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03%  Stock Option 5.00% MVP #4 Awa equipment as	000 under bud oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 issi ker that I des 60,000 under ated among to 0.00% is awarded; 2 0.00% orded (by surp and other pack	dget, and pass s computers was scomputers was \$5,702.00.  I for patent for used 7/20/06. Gigned is qualify budget and pop management \$5,987.10.  0%/year mature \$6,228.33 prise). Award ser design star	sed testing on vorldwide. Stall \$285.10 Stall \$311.42 Stal	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery System who did not 0 psi pressure on first try. \$0.00 \$0.00 has been inchester is the	patitor Bakers of \$ packers of \$ \$ \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute and which is the Two packers of \$6,228.33 will come with \$6,539.75 of tumental in the deader in the contribute and \$10.00 ft.	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came we senior Technical Prof. Pocket Mandrel Removal Syre listed first on patent. In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 senior Technical Prof.	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tex bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise  d from these stock options.  Promotion  Sting envelopes for packer notation and sharing his
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05 5/17/05 9/1/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT paci completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03%  Stock Option 5.00% MVP #4 Awa equipment ar knowledge in bonus.	000 under bud oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 iss ker that I des 60,000 under ated among to 0.00% s awarded; 2 0.00% orded (by surp and other pack ordice prace	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for ued 7/20/06. igned is qualif budget and p op manageme \$5,987.10  0%/year matu \$6,228.33  orise). Award ser design star ctices Award	sed testing on vorldwide. Stall \$285.10   Fiber Optic Election of the Stall St	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery System who did noted on first try. \$0.00 \$0.00 seald more was \$0.00 has been inchester is the echnology material storage of the	patitor Bakers at \$   \$5,987.10 em and Side contribute and side co	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 60,000 each. Award came we senior Technical Prof. Pocket Mandrel Removal Systematical first on patent. In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 senior Technical Prof. Principal Technical Prof. Creating and publishing operation of technical documents my immediate group, and the solution of technical documents of t	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise d from these stock options.  Promotion these stock options are stock options.  Promotion stock options are stock options.  Promotion stock options are stock options.  Promotion and sharing his came with \$1000 pre-tax
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05 5/17/05 9/1/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pac completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03%  Stock Option 5.00% MVP #4 Awa equipment as knowledge in bonus. Handed in re Last day in the	000 under bud oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 issi ker that I des 60,000 under ated among to 0.00% Is awarded; 2 0.00% Inded (by surp and other pack is concise practice office, I did	dget, and pass s computers w \$5,702.00 I for patent for ued 7/20/06. igned is qualif budget and p op manageme \$5,987.10  0%/year matu \$6,228.33  orise). Award ter design star ctices Award and not leave to	sed testing on vorldwide. State \$285.10 Fiber Optic E Others names lied for 20,000 assed testing ent. \$241.23  THE Gary Ellis \$311.42 Says Chester neards	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery System who did note on first try. \$0.00 \$ said more was been inchester is the echnology manufactured to	npetitor Bakers of \$ packers of \$ \$ 5,987.10 em and Side contribute and \$ \$ \$ 6,228.33 evill come with \$ \$ 6,228.33 evill come with \$ \$ 6,539.75 efrumental in the canager outside ffered further	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 50,000 each. Award carne we Senior Technical Prof.  Pocket Mandrel Removal Systematics of the senior Technical Prof.  In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 and the senior Technical Prof.  Ithms. No benefit ever gained Principal Technical Prof.  Principal Technical Prof.  Creating and publishing operatoreation of technical documents.	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise  d from these stock options Promotion  sting envelopes for packer notation and sharing his came with \$1000 pre-tax ter" program.
8/1/04 1/19/05 3/1/05 4/1/05 5/17/05 9/1/05 12/19/05	weeks, \$50,0 went on State 5.00% Application # Patent #2006 BP HNT pac completed \$6 e-mail circula 4.03%  Stock Option 5.00% MVP #4 Awa equipment ar knowledge in bonus. Handed in re Last day in the	000 under bud oil employees 0.00% 038369 filed 00159400 issi ker that I des 60,000 under ated among to 0.00% s awarded; 2 0.00% arded (by surp and other pack a concise pract signation at 8 ate office, I did ate to 1/4/06	dget, and pass s computers was scomputers was secomputers was \$5,702.00. If for patent for used 7/20/06. If gined is qualify budget and pop manageme \$5,987.10. If \$6,228.33 or ise). Award ser design star chices Award sam, resignations.	sed testing on vorldwide. Stall \$285.10 Fiber Optic E Others names lied for 20,000 assed testing ent. \$241.23 Five. Gary Ellis \$311.42 says Chester ndards. Clid came from the control on is effective go home until ritten objection.	first try; Constoil bought 3 \$0.00 Delivery System who did not 0 psi pressure on first try. \$0.00 seald more was \$0.00 has been inshester is the echnology many of 1/15/08. On 1/15/08.	npetitor Bakers of \$ packers of \$ \$ 5,987.10 em and Side contribute and \$ \$ \$ 6,228.33 evill come with \$ \$ 6,228.33 evill come with \$ \$ 6,539.75 efrumental in the canager outside ffered further	tried 5x in 2 years and failed 50,000 each. Award came we senior Technical Prof. Pocket Mandrel Removal System is tended first on patent. In highest rating anywhere in the sold to customer at \$142,000 senior Technical Prof. Principal Technical Prof. Principal Technical Prof. Principal Technical Prof. Principal Technical documents of technical documents.	d. Big win for HES - news ith \$1000 pre-tax bonus.  Promotion stem that I designed.  he world. Project is each. "Packer milestone"  2004 Review/Raise  d from these stock options Promotion sting envelopes for packer notation and sharing his came with \$1000 pre-tax ter" program.